



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,203	02/22/2005	Yuichi Takagi	SON-2815	7661
23353 7590 10/02/2008 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
EXAMINER JOSEPH, DENNIS P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/02/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/525,203	Applicant(s) TAKAGI ET AL.
Examiner DENNIS P. JOSEPH	Art Unit 2629

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-28.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Please see attached sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Amr Awad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are respectfully not persuasive. A request for reconsideration is requested.

The claim amendments have been entered for appeal and a discussion of the remarks filed after the final rejection will be addressed below. Applicant is reminded that if he feels some of his elements are not taught that he should incorporate them into his independent claims.

With respect to Claim 1, Applicant does not seem to argue the Yamaguchi primary reference, but more the Koyama reference and specifically the combination. It is the Examiner's understanding that Applicant feels these references cannot be combined together as the functionality is destroyed. The Office Action stated that Yamaguchi teaches of a reference current source, item 12 as shown in Figure 1, so he does teach of a current input means. What the action stated he didn't explicitly teach was that the driver had a sample and holding means for the current that it generated. However, a sample and hold circuit is well known in the art to hold the signal temporarily before it is converted. Yamaguchi even mentions as a latching and holding means in Column 6, Lines 46-64. This details the capturing and holding means. Again, this concept is well known in the art. To emphasize that point, Koyama was combined with Yamaguchi to teach of a sample and hold means. It is important to note that this is a 103 obviousness, not a 102 anticipatory. Yamaguchi teaches of the reference current source and the input/output current means. While he mentions, or at least suggests, of a holding and controlling means, Koyama was combined to better emphasize this point. It is the sampling and holding which is being stressed, not the voltage drive loads as Applicant is arguing. Current and voltage driving schemes are well known, to the point where the same driving circuitry can be done with both schemes. Combined, Yamaguchi teaches of the reference current source, a plurality of drivers and the output means and Koyama teaches of emphasizing on Yamaguchi's capturing and latching means. This combination does not destroy the functionality of Yamaguchi and a technique that is well known to be used with either current or voltage applications would be combined with one of ordinary skill in the art. Yamaguchi does indeed at least suggest of this means, so Applicant's arguments that it cannot be combined or would not be obvious is not persuasive based on the teachings of KSR rulings, such as known techniques and teachings, suggestions, or motivation in the primary reference. Since the Examiner stated in the Final Rejection and again here that sample and holding with current means is well known, here are some listed references (all prior art) to support that statement:

US 2003/0038898 A1, Otani et al.
 US 6,452,576 B1, Van Velzen et al.
 US 6,278,444 B1, Wilson et al.
 US 6,239,788 B1, Nohno et al.
 US 6,091,390, Sim

Again, it is important to note the 103 combination and the teachings of KSR. It is the examiner's stance that this rebuffs Applicant's arguments that Yamaguchi does not at least suggest of considering a sample and hold circuitry in the Yamaguchi circuitry (Page 12 of Remarks), that sample and holding is not a known technique in the art (Page 10) and that one would not be motivated to combine the two references (Pages 10-11)

Applicant has not argued of the teachings of Yamaguchi, but rather of the combination and the Koyama reference. Examiner feels these arguments have been addressed with the above.

With respect to Claim 3, Applicant argues that Yamaguchi does not teach of the first and second memories in the same way that Applicant's invention claims them to be used, or intends them to be used (Page 12 of the Remarks). Applicant argues the memories units are part of the pixel and not part of the line drive circuit. However, Applicant does not argue against the actual functionality of the memory units other than for the type of memory units being used. There is nothing in the claim limitations which differentiates the memories of Applicants and Yamaguchi's. The location is a design choice given that no specific benefit has been claimed yet. Even still, location of parts has been upheld by case law for electrical components such as capacitors, inductors, etc. It is important to note the functionality is the same and Applicant hasn't argued against this point yet.

With respect to Claim 6, Applicant argues that Yamaguchi does not teach of a vertical blanking period (Pages 13-14 of Remarks). Claim 6 recites "in a vertical blanking period during which operations on said image data are suspended." Yamaguchi teaches of an enable signal as shown in Figure 1, which is described further in Column 6, Lines 42-46. Combined with a clock signal, an enable signal is sent to the control unit 11 to control application of signals to the driving circuitry. This is indeed a triggering means in which operations of image data can be suspended. An on/off signal indeed leads to a vertical blanking of the display shown to the user by disabling the image data processing. Enable/clock or some type of timing signals are indeed inherent in these kinds of displays for controlling the processing units. Applicant argues that it would be non-functional for Yamaguchi to teach this limitation, but this is not persuasive as not only is the functionality there, it is disclosed in Figure 1 with these various signals.

With respect to Claim 7, Applicant argues that Yamaguchi does not teach of a common current interconnect CML1 as shown in Applicant's Figure 4 (Pages 14-15 of Remarks) Claim 7 recites "the reference current input terminal being connected to a reference current input terminal of another driver by a common current interconnect." Seeing Applicant's Figure 4, the CML1 line simply connects the various current source circuits 200-1 to 200-n together with a current. Yamaguchi's Figure 1 shows the reference current generation circuit 12 which sends multiple current lines to the current driver circuits. These lines are not only connect the current drivers to the generation circuit, but are also connected to each other. Examiner feels this satisfies the claim limitation as currently claimed. As for Applicant's argument that this is not done by time division (Page 15), this is not considered to be persuasive. Yamaguchi's circuit is not done by code division and at various times he discloses timing controls. This is further supported by his clock, latch and enable signals as shown in Figure 1 and discussed in Column 6, lines 42-46. This provides for time based control at the very least.

Applicant has not responded to the Official Notice references provided in the Final Rejection, so those will not be discussed at this time.

Applicant is advised to better claim his structure as shown in Figure 4 or maybe the driving process to differentiate it from the prior arts.

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are respectfully not persuasive. Examiner feels that all of the points raised in the after final arguments have been addressed and that the response is complete. Again, the amendments have been entered for an appeal. A request for reconsideration is respectfully requested as well.